UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 23 CR 197(JS)

-against- : United States Courthouse

Central Islip, New York

1

GEORGE SANTOS,

Defendant. : August 13, 2024

10:30 AM

- - - - - - - - - - - X

CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR ARRAIGNMENT AND PRETRIAL CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOANNA SEYBERT UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: U. S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE

EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

271 Cadman Plaza East Brooklyn, New York 11201 BY: RYAN HARRIS, ESQ.

LAURA ZUCKERWISE, ESQ. ANTHONY BAGNUOLA, ESQ.

Assistant United States Attorneys

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE - CRIMINAL DIVISION

1301 New York Avenue NW Washington, DC 20530 BY: JOHN TADDEI, ESQ. JACOB STEINER, ESQ.

For the Defendant: MANCILLA & FANTONE, LLP

260 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor

New York, New York 10016 BY: ANDREW MANCILLA, ESQ. ROBERT FANTONE, JR., ESQ.

JOSEPH MURRAY, ESQ.

185 Great Neck Road, Suite 461 Great Neck, New York 11021

Court Reporter: Lisa Schmid, CCR, RMR

Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography.

Transcript produced by Computer-aided Transcription.

2 1 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Calling Criminal Case 23 CR 2 197, United States of America versus George Santos. 3 Counsel, please state your appearances for the record. 4 Good morning, Your Honor. Ryan 5 MR. HARRIS: Harris for the United States. I'm joined by John Taddai, 6 7 Jacob Steiner, Laura Zuckerwise, and Anthony Bagnuola, all 8 represent the United States. 9 THE COURT: Good morning to you all. 10 MR. MURRAY: Good morning, Your Honor. 11 Murry for the defendant, former Congressman George Santos, 12 and I'm joined by Andrew Mancilla and Robert Fantone on 13 the defense team. Good morning. 14 THE COURT: Good morning to you all also. 15 As a matter of procedure, there's an arraignment 16 that has to occur first, and the defendant has or will 17 enter a not guilty plea to the charges in the indictment. 18 Is that correct? 19 That is correct, Your Honor. MR. MURRAY: 20 THE COURT: All right. And under Rule 5(f), I 21 direct the prosecution to comply with its obligation under 22 Brady versus Maryland and its progeny to disclose to the 23 defense all information, whether admissible our not, that 24 is favorable to the defendant, material either to guilt or 25 to punishment and known to the prosecution.

4 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 1 2 THE COURT: All right. No questions, right? THE DEFENDANT: 3 No. THE COURT: With regard to this proceeding 4 today, a matter of technical issues that I'd like to rule 5 on, and I don't think there's need for any further 6 7 argument. They have all been presented, some of them late 8 last night, but they have all come in. 9 So with regard to this case, as we all know, the 10 defendant was charged in a 23-count indictment with crimes 11 related to five separate criminal schemes: 12 conspiracy to commit offenses against the United States; 13 two, wire fraud; three, false statements; four, 14 falsification of a document; five, access device fraud; 15 six, aggravated identity theft; seven, unlawful money 16 transactions; and theft of public monies. 17 I'm not going to review the statements contained 18 in the indictment, of course. 19 The second thing that I want to get to is 20 essentially, we all know that the Motion to Dismiss was 21 denied as to the three counts it was made upon, and the 22 Brady, Giglio material, obviously, the Government was 23 compelled to provide it, as they are again in this 24 Indictment. 25 The motion to strike surplusage from all the

5 items from the S-2 Indictment, all those items have been 1 2 gone into and ruled upon. Now we're talking about pretrial motions, the 3 Government's voluminous Motions in Limine. 4 On August 2nd, 2024, the Government filed 5 Motions in Limine, seeking the admission of 6 7 proffer-protected statements for the limited purposes 8 outlined in the proffer agreement; second, the admission 9 of evidence of certain bad acts; three, the preclusion of 10 selective prosecution arguments for the admission of the 11 defendant's statements; five, the admissions of the 12 coconspirator statements; six, the preclusion or 13 authenticity challenges to the documents produced by the 14 defendant; seven, the preclusion of impermissible use of 15 agent reports for impeachment; eight, the admission of 16 evidence related to the SEC action against Investment 17 Firm Number One; and nine, preclusion of evidence related 18 to punishment. And that was filed under ECF Number 92. 19 Defendant shall respond by August 16th. 20 date remains, and hopefully, it will be met. 21 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor? 22 THE COURT: Yes. 23 MR. HARRIS: You may have been just about to --24 THE COURT: Explain why there's a later date 25 with the exchange being given to the Court?

MR. HARRIS: No, Your Honor. I was just going to mention that we also filed a motion to compel discovery as part of that.

THE COURT: Yes, as part of that, and that obviously will require the defendant to get that information in because if you don't, I'm going to stop you from using it at trial.

In terms of the general position the Court has with *in limine* motions, voluminous papers do not have to be submitted. It happens at trial when the Government gets up, and makes their opening statement and the defendant makes his opening statement, that's when the Court can, as the trial proceeds and I get the list of witnesses and their proposed testimony, that's when I can fairly evaluate what evidence should be precluded, what evidence should have come in.

If the defendant failed to provide evidence that the Government is entitled to, then he's not getting it in at trial.

And in terms of making arguments about selective prosecution, I think counsel on both sides is experienced enough to know that punishment, selective prosecution are not issues for a jury. They're issues for the Court, and I'll decide them accordingly. So a little bit of a warning on that.

But the *in limine* motions at this point in time, they're not ripe for decision, and I don't intend to go through a lengthy analysis of them.

So that having been said, we can get on to what seems to be the issue here for both the Government and the defendant, and that is the proposed examination of the jurors.

You have a joint request on proposed *voir dire* questions, and that was submitted at the beginning of August. There are several of the questions that the Government objects to.

And the motion for an anonymous jury and jury questionnaire, the Government opposes the motion for a jury questionnaire -- and I agree with the Government.

One of the worse things I've come across in the thirty-plus years I have been a judge is a written questionnaire. It offends people. We want people to come in and give up up to six weeks of their life to sit on this case, and it's important that we treat them with respect.

Not that questionnaires aren't necessary in certain cases. I have used them before. They're very inefficient. You drag in two hundred people on the first day of trial. You give them the questionnaires. They have to fill them out in court. And then you go over it,

back and forth with the parties as to who can stay, who should come back. Very inefficient.

I think individual *voir dire*, which I have used for many years, is the way to go. You ask general questions. It's not like you're going into a doctor's office or you have a business appointment and someone hands you a questionnaire. You're asking jurors to donate, to come to be devoted to this case, so the defendant gets a fair trial, and the Government is able to present the evidence it believes is worthy of a conviction.

So from that point, I think everybody should recognize that I will do individual questioning of jurors. They will come up. They'll first be given a case description *en masse*. They'll be given what the requirements are to be a juror, a fair and impartial juror.

Out of the 800 people that were summoned several weeks ago in jury summonses, 700 remain. The first hundred or so -- 702 -- the first hundred or so had excuses. They were assigned to different dates. They were given time to go on vacation, plans that they had made far in advance. So we're left with 702 people.

Out of the 702 people, we have had responses most recently from 300 -- there are 348 jurors that are

available as of today, and that number will go up because some people will check out their schedules and they'll respond.

So at this point, it's estimated that 348 people will be available. We figure those that come in, somewhere around two hundred, but eventually, they'll be 300 jurors available. So from around 800, we're now down to 348 that are definitely available, and that number will probably go up.

So the first day -- this is what I contemplate -- we'll have them come in in groups, ceremonial courtroom. I'll do the case description, describe what the jurors are required to do, how they're going to be treated, what the schedule is.

I always make them a promise I'm not going to waste their time, and the lawyers and the parties and the witnesses, aren't going to waste their time.

So we start promptly at 9:30. We have a mid-morning break, and then we have a break for lunch. We go to the afternoon.

If we have jurors taking public transportation, means will be taken for them to get to train stations, et cetera. But they must know that we generally don't sit on Friday, and what their requirements will be to serve as jurors.

After you give them that, they'll go outside, and then we'll individually call jurors -- and yes, it is somewhat tedious, but using a written questionnaire as compared to an individual one-on-one *voir dire* with the judge and the parties present makes a lot more sense.

You get spontaneous responses. You can ask more probing questions. You're able to hear about the jurors, not just directly ask them what their political affiliation is. You can ask -- I can ask them a whole variety of questions that will obviously help you decide what jurors are for cause, which ones you want to use your peremptory challenges on, and it's, to me, a lot more efficient.

Sending out a questionnaire to them on the first day there and then having them come back, not know if they're coming back, jamming up their schedules for weeks at a time.

So that's why I do it individually. I get spontaneous. I get what I consider truthful responses, and I also get to see how the juror interacts with questions and discussions. I want 12 people in there that get along with each other, not that I'm going to have issues.

So individual *voir dire* questions of a more sensitive nature I think is a fairer way to go and much

more efficient, even though at first, it seems rather tedious. So that's one portion of it.

I know we'll be done in a week. So the jury's going to be instructed that they have to come back on the 16th, and we should be done with jury selection the week before.

In addition, when they come back, we'll set them up, and I have previously explained that they're going to be an anonymous -- partially anonymous jury. Only the Government and defense counsel and the defendant will know the identity of the jurors.

The press will be present during *voir dire*. I'm not looking to exclude the press. They have a right to be here.

However, I implore everybody in this case, don't start doing any independent research or investigation. I can't preclude you from doing it, but if I find -- because I always tell jurors, let me know if someone has reached out to you in any fashion, and don't discuss that endeavor with the other jurors. So it's pretty clear that I want the jury protected from any outside influence.

With regard to publicity, I don't control the press. I don't tell them what to put in the papers. I expect that everyone here, the parties involved, will respect my direction. Obviously, the Government can't

contact jurors, and the defendant can't contact jurors. You're the only ones that know their identity, and you can't share them with other people. Straightforward enough?

Let me just double-check to see if there's anything else on the questionnaire or the produced questions.

I'll ask question general questions that will lead me down to find out whether or not the ultimate question is, can the juror be fair and impartial? Do they have any preconceived notions? Will they respect the right of the defendant not to testify if he choses not to testify? Do they hold the Government to proof beyond a reasonable doubt? Can they be fair and impartial?

That's all we're looking for, twelve fair and impartial people that understand English, that can pay attention, that don't have any pressing requirements that would cause them not to be available for their service as jurors.

In the words of Arthur Spatt, jury service is just as important as military service, and I hope to endeavor to convince the jurors that that is the type of trial we're going to be having.

So additional things with respect to my rulings in terms of question 60, whether or not the political

13 1 background -- I think I've described how I will make 2 inquiry, general inquiry, and then ask them if they are --3 if there is any view that they have, whether it be politics or anything related to a person's identity, 4 gender or otherwise that would cause them not to be fair 5 and impartial here. 6 7 Has there been any additional 16(b) reciprocal 8 discovery that's been conducted? 9 Mr. Murray? MR. MURRAY: Your Honor, I just want to point 10 11 out that I have had a working relationship with Mr. Ryan 12 predating the indictment. There were grand jury subpoenas 13 that we've complied with. There was discovery turned 14 over. 15 In addition --16 THE COURT: There was a proffer. 17 Yes. So I don't want the Court to MR. MURRAY: 18 be of the opinion that we are stonewalling them and not 19 sharing information. We have been. So I just want to 20 make that clear, Judge. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 What are you looking for, Mr. Ryan, that you 23 haven't gotten? 24 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, the Government wrote to 25 defense counsel I think more than a month ago asking

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

14 confirmation that it either produce all reciprocal discovery or would do by a date certain. I think we said the end of July. THE COURT: Yes. MR. HARRIS: We didn't receive a reply from defense counsel, so we have had no representation that they have completed their reciprocal discovery obligations or that they intend to by a date before trial. What we are simply seeking to avoid is, you know, finding out if there are documents they intend to introduce in evidence or cross-examine the witnesses with that have never been turned over in discovery, and we have not received that assurance to date. MR. MURRAY: Judge, I just want to say that I do not subscribe to the tactic of trial by ambush. never knowingly delay disclosure versus not disclose something and try to introduce it later. That's not how I operate. That's not how any of us operate. In the abundance of caution, we are checking with all possible resources for any other material that might be suitable to turn over. As of right now, we haven't found any, but that goes on. We're going to continue until we have exhausted all efforts. THE COURT: That sounds like almost? MR. MURRAY: Yes.

| | 4.5 |
|----|--|
| | 15 |
| 1 | THE COURT: Mr. Murray, they'll be an |
| 2 | examination if documents come in as to why you didn't find |
| 3 | them earlier, and I'll make that determination at trial. |
| 4 | MR. MURRAY: Understandable. |
| 5 | THE COURT: At this point at this point, |
| 6 | you're saying there's nothing that you have that you need |
| 7 | to turn over under Rule 16? |
| 8 | MR. MURRAY: Yes. Nothing in our possession |
| 9 | that we have that we need to turn over. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Or nothing that you know about out |
| 11 | there? |
| 12 | MR. MURRAY: Yes, or that we know about. |
| 13 | But again, this involved a campaign. There's |
| 14 | complications with the campaign in the way they stored |
| 15 | their material. So we are leaving no stone unturned to |
| 16 | look for certain material. |
| 17 | MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I'll take Mr. Murray at |
| 18 | his word at this stage; however, if documents come to |
| 19 | light during trial, we will ask the Court to preclude |
| 20 | them, and we want defense counsel to be on notice of that. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Obviously, he's on notice, and the |
| 22 | Court is aware. |
| 23 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 24 | THE COURT: Thank you both. |
| 25 | Okay. I think we've straightened out the dates |
| | |

16 1 that defendant has to comply -- let me get this 2 straight -- with respect to the parties getting together. 3 Let me say one thing that I think is very important for both sides to consider, and that is, the 4 Government claims they need three weeks for trial. 5 Oftentimes, if the Government and defense can sit down and 6 7 do things we call stipulations -- you don't need ten 8 witnesses to come in and say the same thing over and over 9 and over and over again. 10 (Nods head affirmatively.) MR. HARRIS: 11 THE COURT: Preliminary items, defense can 12 stipulate to them. Certain documents are coming in. 13 There's no need to have in limine motions over and over 14 and over again, repeated objections over and over and over 15 This can be streamlined. again. 16 How many witnesses do you expect to call, 17 Mr. Harris? 18 MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, we're making every 19 effort to streamline the trial, and we are going to try to 20 stipulate as much as we can. 21 There are a lot of live witnesses in this case 22 because there are a lot of fact witnesses who are victims 23 There are 23 counts. in this case. 24 THE COURT: Yes. 25 MR. HARRIS: I think at this stage, we are

18 1 stipulations, too. 2 We have told them, the one issue that we 3 discussed, previously was the venue issue. It's not necessary for you to prove venue. We'll stipulate to it. 4 THE COURT: Okay. 5 MR. MURRAY: So we're talking about other issues 6 7 where we can find common ground. We want to streamline 8 this as well, Judge. MR. HARRIS: Your Honor, I can assure you that 9 10 both parties will make every effort to streamline this 11 trial as much as we can. 12 THE COURT: Make me hopeful. 13 Seriously, I mean, this is not a case -- you 14 have the -- I quess I could say quasi-advantage of having 15 a somewhat anonymous jury, somewhat in the sense that 16 defense and Government and people in the clerk's office 17 know the jurors' identity. 18 So it's important that you sit down and discuss 19 what's absolutely necessary, and I don't know what the 20 defendant intends to offer, if anything, on the defense 21 case. 22 But four weeks for a trial, that's a long time 23 for a jury, and that's excluding jury selection. So until 24 I hear to the contrary that there's something else, that's

what I'm going to advise the jury of.

25

21 1 they're here. 2 The problem sometime is just getting in a car, 3 going out, getting lunch and so forth, so we'll see what we can do. 4 But of course, the same rules apply: No contact 5 by the Government or defense with jurors. So on the day 6 7 of jury selection, come in around like 10:30. Eric, you think we have a lot coming in? 8 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Yeah, 10:30 should be good. 9 10 THE COURT: 10:30, we'll set you up in the 11 ceremonial courtroom. 12 COURTROOM DEPUTY: Judge, they'll meet here. THE COURT: Oh, we'll start out here. That's my 13 14 usual practice, to start out here the day of jury selection. 15 16 Stay out of the elevators with anyone you don't 17 know, same for the Government. And there shouldn't be 18 much traffic between the tenth floor and the second floor 19 where the ceremonial courtroom is. But just pay 20 attention. Don't talk about the case when you're in the 21 elevator or in close proximity to other people. 22 Of course the Court will let them MR. MURRAY: 23 Obviously, if someone says good morning to us, know. 24 we're going to ignore them, but I want them to interpret 25 us as being --

agreement or do we need to move to compel that she be

25

25 1 granted immunity, so she can testify? 2 It's so pivotal to our defense to have our 3 campaign treasurer take the stand under oath that I don't think we can do without, and I just have no answers at 4 this point -- and it might end up -- because that's a 5 cumbersome process -- it might delay the process if we 6 7 wait for the exchange of the witness. THE COURT: Mr. Harris or --8 9 MR. HARRIS: My colleague, Mr. Taddei, is going 10 to address this issue. 11 THE COURT: All right. 12 MR. TADDEI: Thank you, Your Honor. 13 So they haven't filed any paper on this, 14 obviously, but we are prepared to address it orally at 15 Your Honor's convenience. As Your Honor is aware, there 16 is a --17 THE COURT: I'm readv. 18 MR. TADDEI: -- a three-factor test for this. 19 They have to allege first that the Government engaged in 20 discriminatory use of immunity to gain a tactical 21 advantage. They have to show that the witness's testimony 22 would be material, exculpatory, and not cumulative. 23 they need to show that the testimony must be unobtainable 24 from any other source. 25 And that's from *Turkish*, 623 F. 2d at 777.

general rule is that the Government should not be compelled to confer immunity on a defense witness in order to benefit the defense.

Now, of course, they are going to get our witness list, Your Honor, on the 19th. At that point -- THE COURT: Right.

MR. TADDEI: -- they will know whether or not the Government plans to call this particular witness at trial.

At this point, they have made no allegation that they have met any of those three factors from *Turkish* that require immunization of any particular witness. So the issue hasn't even really been raised formally to this point. There have been references to it over time.

But our position would be, one, it's unclear whether or not we're even going to call this particular witness; and two, they haven't met the legal standard that they're required to meet in order to compel immunity at this time.

MR. MURRAY: Judge, Mr. Taddei is correct. We have not filed a formal motion. As I indicated, there are very few things that we have not been able to work out on our own. We were hoping to resolve that together. This is the first time I'm hearing now from the Government that they may not call her.

| | 28 |
|----|--|
| 1 | necessary, Judge. |
| 2 | THE COURT: Sure. |
| 3 | Anything else? |
| 4 | MR. HARRIS: Not from the Government. |
| 5 | MR. MURRAY: Not from the defense. Thank you, |
| 6 | Judge. |
| 7 | THE COURT: All right. So I will see you folks |
| 8 | on September 9th, absent any emergencies or motions that |
| 9 | need to be decided. |
| 10 | That completes the proceeding. Have a good day. |
| 11 | MR. HARRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 12 | THE COURT: You're welcome. |
| 13 | (Proceedings concluded.) |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |